APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,623	07/24/2002	Josef Laumen	10191/2377	1416

26646 7590 01/02/2004		EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON		CORSARO, NICK	
ONE BROADWAY			
NEW YORK, NY 10004	ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
	2684		10

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/089,623		LAUMEN ET AL.
	Examiner		Art Unit
	Nick Corsaro		2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 October 2003</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>15-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>15-31</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/06/2003 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

The applicants features in the claims wherein a method of transmitting information

between a main station and a terminal via a telecommunications network involves providing a

matching device between the main station and the terminal device, controlling a message

exchange using the matching device, the message exchange being controlled in dependence upon

at least on input from one of the terminal and the at least one main station, wherein the message

is transmitted in a format that is determined in dependence upon a format request made by one of

the at least terminal and the at least one main station, reads upon Schwartz in view of Kingdon,

as follows.

Schwartz is disclosing a method and apparatus for the transmission of information

between a terminal and an Internet server via a Wireless communication network. Therefore,

Schwartz is disclosing the feature of "transmitting information between a terminal and at least

one main station", where the Internet server is the at least one main station. Schwartz further

discloses an intermediate device between the terminal and the Internet server to perform protocol

conversion and connection between the devices. Therefore, Schwartz is disclosing a matching

device. Schwartz further discloses when the user uses the terminal via an interface such as a

Web browser the matching device based on the inputs at the terminal performs bi-directional

communication with the Internet server. Therefore, Schwartz discloses the message transfer is

controlled in dependence upon the at least one input from one of the terminal and the main station.

As a result, prior to the applicant's amendments, Schwartz shows all of the argued features.

Upon amendment the applicant adds the feature of the message transmitted in a format determined by the input of a format request. Therefore Kingdon is a new reference that used to modify Schwartz to show it is obvious to have the message transmitted in a format determined by a format request.

In response to the applicant's argument that Schwartz does not teach converting text to voice mail or text to fax, the argued feature is not in eh claim and therefore the argument is not persuasive.

In response to the applicants argument that Schwartz does not show the message exchange is dependent upon at least one input from one of the terminal or main station, the argument is not persuasive in that Schwartz is discussing fetching of information base upon a user using an internet browsers to select information and therefore, the message exchange is base upon the user input.

In response to the applicants argument that Schwartz does not show the format request made by one of the user terminal and the main station, the argument is not persuasive in that the argued limitation was added upon amendment, and therefore, is shown by Kingdon.

Regarding the applicants arguments on the dependent claims, those features have been shown by modifying secondary references of Boyle, Schwartz (B), and Smethers, wherein the

cited secondary references are showing similar systems however with added features such as storing messages and Alerts to be delivered to the user once the terminal is activated.

Regarding the applicant's arguments on newly added claims 30 and 31, the applicant has added the feature of two main stations, wherein Schwartz is discussing the main stations are internet servers therefore one inherently more than one, and Kingdon modifies to show the internet addresses are intended for more than one main station.

Therefore the argued features either are the same as the cited art or are written with such breadth that they read upon the cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 15-18, 23, 28, 29, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz et al. (6,473,609) in view of Kingdon et al. (6,088,594).

Consider claim 15, Schwartz discloses a method for transmitting messages between at least one main station (104, figure 1) and a terminal (106) via a telecommunications network (102) (see col. 1 lines 30-40, col. 3 lines 37-55, col. 5 lines 8-47, col.7 lines 47-67, where Schwartz is discussing a mobile terminal with access to an internet server, the internet server being a main station). Schwartz discloses providing a matching device (114) between the at least one main station and the terminal (see col. 5 lines 47-61, col. 5 lines 8-26, col. 7 lines 9-28, col. 7 lines 47-67, where Schwartz discusses that the link server acts as the protocol matching device

between the wireless network and the internet). Schwartz discloses controlling a message

exchange using the matching device, the message exchange being controlled in dependence upon

at least one input from one of, the terminal, and the at least one main station (see col. 3 lines 38-

55, col. 5 lines 47-61, col. 7 lines 55-62, col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 9 lines 29-41, col. 10 lines 35-53,

col. 11 lines 4-9, col. 13 lines 25-38, col. 13 lines 64-66, col. 14 lines 10-58 where in reference to

figures 6-7, Schwartz discusses the user makes inputs from the terminal to the link server, i.e.,

the matching device, to get data from different network servers by sending a URL of the desired

server, therefore, dependent upon the input from the mobile the link server gets various forms of

data from the network).

Schwartz discloses user requests for information from different servers and format

translations based on the information requested, and therefore logically the information is

transmitted in a format based on the request (col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 15 lines 1-8, col. 8 lines 45-

67, col. 10 lines 3-8, col. 11 lines 15-35, col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 15 lines 1-8, col. 8 lines 45-67,

col. 10 lines 3-8, col. 11 lines 15-35). Schwartz, however, does not specifically disclose the

message is transmitted in a format that is determined in dependence upon a format request made

by one of the terminal and the at least one main station. Kingdon teaches disclose the message

is transmitted in a format that is determined in dependence upon a format request made by one of

the terminal and the at least one main station (see abstract lines 1-10, and col. 4 lines 9-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and have the message is transmitted in a format

that is determined in dependence upon a format request made by one of the terminal and the at

least one main station, as taught by Kingdon, thus allowing the transmission of more complex

responses, such as bit mapped responses, as discussed by Kingdon (col. 3 lines 12-36).

Consider claim 16, Schwartz discloses matching, by a matching device, at least one

characteristic for transmission of a message to the at least one input (see col. 14 lines 10-67, col.

15 lines 1-8, col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 10 lines 3-8, col. 11 lines 15-35, where Schwartz discusses

based on the request for communication and the inputs from the user of the terminal, i.e., the

inputs sent to the link server as a URL and device characteristics, the link server retrieves a

specified type of data from the network server, formats the data for transmission to the mobile

terminal and display on the mobile).

Consider claim 17, Schwartz discloses the at least one characteristic is at least one of a

data type, a data format and a transmission mode (see col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 15 lines 1-8, col. 8

lines 45-67, col. 10 lines 3-8, col. 11 lines 15-35, where Schwartz discusses receiving a URL

specifying a server and formatting the message according to the device characteristics, sent or

inputted to the link server at the start of a communication).

Consider claim 18, Schwartz discloses converting, by the matching device, messages

from the at least one main station into a standardized form readable by the terminal; and

transmitting the converted messages to the terminal (see col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 9 lines 15-40,

col. 10 lines 3-16, col. 15 lines 39-65, col. 16 lines 30-65 and col. 19 lines 1-17, where Schwartz

discusses changing the file to SDD format to send to the terminal in more efficiently).

Consider claim 23, Schwartz discloses inputting by a user of the terminal the at least one

input from the terminal in the form of a data record; and transmitting the data record to the

matching device (see col. 13 lines 25-38, col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 15 lines 39-65, col. 16 lines 30-

65, col. 18 lines 11-16, col. 19 lines 18-67 and col. 20 lines 1-31, where Schwartz discusses each

request/input is actually composed of several fields, therefore a record, where the message is a

URL specifying server with a particular type of information).

Consider claim 28, Schwartz discloses using protocols in the terminal and the matching

device which include functional elements for a predefined transmission mode for the

transmission of a message; and effecting a suitable signaling of the message for the terminal (see

col. 5 lines 47-61, col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 3 lines 45-67, col. 4 lines 1-9, col. 7 lines 1-21, col. 9

lines 29-67, col. 10 lines 3-8, and col. 11 lines 18-33, where, as shown in figure 3A, 3B, and 6

Schwartz discusses upon starting the session the mobile exchanges characteristic data with the

link server and the server changing the data format for transmission to the mobile, and the link

server makes the protocol conversion).

Consider claim 29, Schwartz discloses a matching device (114, figure 1) for a

transmitting messages between at least one main station (104) and terminal (106) via a

telecommunications network (see col. 1 lines 30-40, col. 3 lines 37-61, col. 5 lines 8-61, col. 7

lines 47-67, and col. 8 lines 46-67, where Schwartz discusses the transmission of messages

between a network server, i.e., main station, and a mobile terminal via a link server that converts

the messages to useable formats, between the devices, therefore, matching formats). Schwartz

discloses at least one interface (302, figure 3A) to the at least one main station; an interface (306)

to the terminal (see col. 6 lines 65-67, col. 7 lines 1-27, and col. 5 lines 8-26). Schwartz

discloses a storage device (316, figure 3A) configured to store at least one input from one of the

terminal and the at least one main station for controlling a message exchange between the at least

one main station and the terminal (see col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 9 lines 15-40, col. 11 lines 15-41,

col. 13 lines 25-38, col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 18 lines 11-16, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 19 lines

1-45, where Schwartz discusses a message exchange processor and memory for processing the

requests and data exchanges). Schwartz discloses a control unit (315, figure 3A) configured to

control the message exchange as a function of the at least one input (see col. 8 lines 46-67, col. 9

lines 15-40, col. 11 lines 15-41, col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 19 lines 1-48,

where Schwartz discusses the user of the terminal inputs commands corresponding to URL's to

access data in different network server that are processed by the message processor).

Schwartz discloses inputs by users to request information of different types the request of

different types logically including format request (see col. 8 lines 46-67), however, Schwartz

does not specifically disclose the at least one input includes a format request made by one of the

terminal and the at least one main station. Kingdon teaches the at least one input includes a

format request made by one of the terminal and the at least one main station (see abstract lines 1-

10, and col. 4 lines 9-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and the at least one input includes a format

request made by one of the terminal and the at least one main station, as taught by Kingdon, thus

allowing the transmission of more complex responses, such as bit mapped responses, as

discussed by Kingdon (col. 3 lines 12-36).

Consider claim 30, Schwartz discloses a method for transmitting messages between at

least one main stations (104, figure 1) and a terminal (106) via a telecommunications network

(102) (see col. 1 lines 30-40, col. 2 lines 30-62, col. 3 lines 37-55, col. 5 lines 8-47, col.7 lines

47-67, where Schwartz is discussing a mobile terminal with access to an internet servers, the

internet server being a main station, a logically one or more main stations addressable by internet

addresses). Schwartz discloses providing a matching device (114) between the at least one main

stations and the terminal (see col. 5 lines 47-61, col. 5 lines 8-26, col. 7 lines 9-28, col. 7 lines

47-67, where Schwartz discusses that the link server acts as the protocol matching device

between the wireless network and the internet). Schwartz discloses controlling a message

exchange using the matching device, the message exchange being controlled in dependence upon

at least one input from one of, the terminal, and the at least one main station (see col. 3 lines 38-

55, col. 5 lines 47-61, col. 7 lines 55-62, col. 8 lines 45-67, col. 9 lines 29-41, col. 10 lines 35-53,

col. 11 lines 4-9, col. 13 lines 25-38, col. 13 lines 64-66, col. 14 lines 10-58 where in reference to

figures 6-7, Schwartz discusses the user makes inputs from the terminal to the link server, i.e.,

the matching device, to get data from different network servers by sending a URL of the desired

server, therefore, dependent upon the input from the mobile the link server gets various forms of

data from the network).

Schwartz discloses the at least one main station is an internet server and therefore

logically is disclosing at least two main stations (see col. 1 lines 30-40, col. 2 lines 30-62, col. 3

lines 37-55, col. 5 lines 8-47, col.7 lines 47-67, where Schwartz is discussing internet addressing

of the main station therefore logically discussing one, two, or more main stations). Schwartz

however does not specifically disclose at least two main stations. Kingdon teaches at least two

main stations (see col. 4 lines 38-45, where Kingdon is discussing connection of a mobile to one

more servers on the internet via the internet addresses).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and have at least two main stations, as

taught by Kingdon, thus allowing the mobile access to many main stations applications via the

Internet and Internet servers, as discussed by Kingdon (col. 3 lines 30-35).

Consider claim 31, Schwartz discloses a matching device (114, figure 1) for a

transmitting messages between at least one main stations (104) and terminal (106) via a

telecommunications network (see col. 1 lines 30-40, col. 2 lines 30-62, col. 3 lines 37-61, col. 5

lines 8-61, col. 7 lines 47-67, and col. 8 lines 46-67, where Schwartz discusses the transmission

of messages between a network internet servers, i.e., one or more main station, and a mobile

terminal via a link server that converts the messages to useable formats, between the devices,

therefore, matching formats). Schwartz discloses at least one interface (302, figure 3A) to the at

least one main stations; an interface (306) to the terminal (see col. 6 lines 65-67, col. 7 lines 1-

27, and col. 5 lines 8-26). Schwartz teaches a storage device (316, figure 3A) configured to store

at least one input from one of the terminal and the at least one main stations for controlling a

message exchange between the at least two main stations and the terminal (see col. 8 lines 45-67,

col. 9 lines 15-40, col. 11 lines 15-41, col. 13 lines 25-38, col. 14 lines 10-67, col. 18 lines 11-16,

col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 19 lines 1-45, where Schwartz discusses a message exchange

processor and memory for processing the requests and data exchanges). Schwartz discloses a

control unit (315, figure 3A) configured to control the message exchange as a function of the at

least one input (see col. 8 lines 46-67, col. 9 lines 15-40, col. 11 lines 15-41, col. 14 lines 10-67,

col. 18 lines 65-67, and col. 19 lines 1-48, where Schwartz discusses the user of the terminal

inputs commands corresponding to URL's to access data in different network server that are

processed by the message processor).

Schwartz discloses the at least one main station is an internet server and therefore

logically is disclosing at least two main stations (see col. 1 lines 30-40, col. 2 lines 30-62, col. 3

lines 37-55, col. 5 lines 8-47, col.7 lines 47-67, where Schwartz is discussing internet addressing

of the main station therefore logically discussing one, two, or more main stations). Schwartz

however does not specifically disclose at least two main stations. Kingdon teaches at least two

main stations (see col. 4 lines 38-45, where Kingdon is discussing connection of a mobile to one

more servers on the internet via the internet addresses).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz, and have at least two main stations, as

taught by Kingdon, thus allowing the mobile access to many main stations applications via the

Internet and Internet servers, as discussed by Kingdon (col. 3 lines 30-35).

4.   Claims 19, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Schwartz et al. (6,473,609) in view of Kingdon et al. (6,088,594) as applied to claim 15 above,

and further in view of Boyle et al. (6,138,158).

Consider claim 19, Schwartz discloses notifying the matching device of an incoming

message for the terminal, by at least one main station (see col. 18 lines 11-43, where Schwartz

discusses network server sending a message directed toward a particular terminal). Schwartz

discloses if the terminal can be reached, initiating a transmission process for the message to the

terminal, according to one of a push transmission and a pull transmission mode (see col. 18 lines

44-67, col. 19 lines 1-18, col. 12 lines 54-67, col. 8 lines 45-67, and col. 9 lines 15-40, where

Schwartz discusses that the messages can be pushed or pulled by the mobile terminal or network

server).

Schwartz discloses checking terminal availability (col. 18 lines 43-50), but Schwartz and

Kingdon do not specifically disclose if the terminal cannot be reached, storing the message until

the matching device recognizes that the terminal can be reached. Boyle discloses if the terminal

cannot be reached, storing the message until the matching device recognizes that the terminal can

be reached (see col. 11 lines 24-50, col. 12 lines 24-31, col. 4 lines 58-67, and col. 5 lines 36-45,

where Boyle queues messages destine for mobile and sends them when the mobile is available).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the invention of Schwartz and Kingdon, and when sending a message, if the

terminal cannot be reached, storing the message until the matching device recognizes that the

terminal can be reached, as taught by Boyle, thus allowing users to be timely and periodically

informed of messages to be delivered when the user becomes available, as discussed by Boyle

(col. 1 lines 41-46, col. 1 lines 55-60, col. 12 lines 28-31).

Consider claim 20, Schwartz discloses transmitting directly to the terminal, as a function

of the input from the terminal a message for the terminal present in the at least one main station

by the matching device when the terminal can be reached (see col. 8 lines 46-67, col. 9 lines 15-

40, col. 10 lines 35-54,col. 11 lines 15-53, col. 12 lines 31-65, col. 13 lines 25-37, col. 18 lines

11-67 and col.19 lines 1-17, and col. 20 lines 18-61, where Schwartz discusses that upon

initiation of a communication session as a function of user input data is fetched and a message

notification is sent and data downloaded).

Schwartz discloses the terminal may not be available (col. 18 lines 42-56), but Schwartz

and Kingdon do not specifically disclose notifying the terminal of the availability of the message

by the matching device, when the terminal cannot be reached. Boyle discloses notifying the

terminal of the availability of the message by the matching device, when the terminal cannot be reached (see col. 12 lines 23-43, and col. 11 lines 30-50, where Boyle discusses queuing messages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz and Kingdon, and when delivering messages, notifying the terminal of the availability of the message by the matching device, when the terminal cannot be reached, as taught by Boyle, thus allowing the user to be timely and periodically informed of messages to be delivered when the user becomes available, as discussed by Boyle (col. 1 lines 41-47, col. 1 lines 55-60, col. 12 lines 28-31).

Consider claim 22, Schwartz discloses converting the message to a form usable by the terminal and sending to the terminal as function of the an input at the terminal as a function of input by the terminal (see col. 7 lines 9-21, col. 8 lines 17-32, col. 8 lines 44-67, col. 9 lines 15-40 and col. 10 lines 3-35, where, as shown in figure 3B, Schwartz discusses a user request and response with data type and the link server converts the message to the protocol used by the terminal based on terminal characteristics).

Schwartz and Kingdon do not specifically disclose segmenting, by the matching device as a function of the input from the terminal individual parts of a message, which includes a plurality of elements, and processing the message by the matching device. Boyle discloses segmenting, by the matching device as a function of the input from the terminal individual parts of a message, which includes a plurality of elements and processing the message by the matching device (see col. 13 lines 35-54, where Boyle discusses that if the air interface is one that does not support an extremely long message, the message is segmented and sent in several messages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the invention of Schwartz and Kingdon, and segment, by the matching

device as a function of the input from the terminal individual parts of a message which includes a

plurality of elements and processing the message by the matching device, when the terminal

cannot be reached, as taught by Boyle, thus when the air interface is narrow band, allowing

messages to be conformed to that protocol used by the device, as discussed by Boyle (col. 2 lines

43-50, col. 12 lines 37-44).

5.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz (A) et

al. (6,473,609) in view Kingdon, as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Schwartz

(B) (6,243,739).

Consider claim 21, Schwartz (A) and Kingdon discloses transmitting messages from

servers, i.e., main stations, to a mobile terminal device (see col. 18 lines 1-67, and col. 19 lines 1-

17).

Schwartz (A) and Kingdon do not specifically disclose transmitting a plurality of

messages, from different ones of the at least one main station, in a combined form to the terminal

by the matching device. Schwartz (B) discloses transmitting a plurality of messages, from

different ones of the at least one main station, in a combined form to the terminal by the

matching device (see col. 10 lines 55-67, and col. 11 lines 1-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the invention of Schwartz (A) and Kingdon, and transmit a plurality of

messages, from different ones of the at least one main station, in a combined form to the terminal

by the matching device, as taught by Schwartz (B), thereby reducing delays in communicating

messages to subscribers, as discussed by Schwartz (B), (col. 2 lines 42-59).

6.   Claim 24-27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz et

al. (6,473,609) in view Kingdon, as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Smethers et

al. (6,560,640).

Consider claim 24, Schwartz discloses inputting by a user of the terminal a plurality of

different a data records for various functionalities that are implement-able by the terminal (see

col. 9 lines 15-20, col. 19 lines 18-67 and col. 20 lines 1-31, where Schwartz discusses the

message from the terminal are one or more URL requests where each request is actually

composed of several fields, i.e., a record, where requests are to access different servers for

different functions of the terminal, such as stock or news etc..).

Schwartz and Kingdon do not specifically disclose storing the plurality of different data

records in storage device assigned to the matching device. Smethers discloses storing the

plurality of different data records in storage device assigned to the matching device (see col. 8

lines 1-57, where Smethers discusses that a user can create a bookmark for the URL and store it

at the server, the bookmark being a URL and associated data, with marked with a shortened

identifier).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the invention of Schwartz and Kingdon, and store the plurality of different

data records in storage device assigned to the matching device, as taught by Smethers, thus

increasing information site access speeds by minimizing actions needed by the user, as discussed

by Smethers (col. 1 lines 57-65).

Consider claim 25, Schwartz discloses each of the plurality of different data records has an assigned URL (see col. 19 lines 18-67).

Schwartz and Kingdon do not specifically disclose each of the plurality of different data records has an assigned identifier. Smethers discloses each of the plurality of different data records has an assigned identifier (see col. 8 lines 25-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz and Kingdon, and have each of the plurality of different data records have an assigned identifier, as taught by Smethers, thus increasing information site access speeds by minimizing actions needed by the user, as discussed by Smethers (col. 1 lines 57-65).

Consider claim 26, Schwartz discloses a user making inputs to access servers; where the input is a data record having a URL and other identifiers (see col. 19 lines 17-65).

Schwartz and Kingdon do not specifically disclose selecting, by the user, one of the plurality of different data records; transmitting the assigned identifying character of the selected data record from the terminal to the matching device; checking, in the matching device, whether a data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device; and if the data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device, selecting, by the matching device, the data record. Smethers discloses selecting, by the user, one of the plurality of different data records; transmitting the assigned identifying character of the selected data record from the terminal to the matching device (see col. 8 lines 37-47). Smethers discloses checking, in the matching device, whether a data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device; and if the data record having the assigned identifying

character is stored in the storage device, selecting, by the matching device, the data record (see col. 8 lines 48-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz and Kingdon, and incorporate selecting, by the user, one of the plurality of different data records; transmitting the assigned identifying character of the selected data record from the terminal to the matching device; checking, in the matching device, whether a data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device; and if the data record having the assigned identifying character is stored in the storage device, selecting, by the matching device, the data record , as taught by Smethers, thus increasing information site access speeds by minimizing actions needed by the user, as discussed by Smethers (col. 1 lines 57-65).

Consider claim 27, Schwartz discloses a user making inputs to access servers; where the input is a data record having a URL and other identifiers (see col. 19 lines 17-65).

Schwartz and Kingdon do not specifically disclose numbering the plurality of different data records in a sequence in which they are stored in the storage device, identifying characters of each of the plurality of data records being formed from the numbering. Smethers discloses numbering the plurality of different data records in a sequence in which they are stored in the storage device, identifying characters of each of the plurality of data records being formed from the numbering (see col. 12 lines 1-31 col. 13 lines 41-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schwartz and Kingdon, and number the plurality of different data records in a sequence in which they are stored in the storage device, identifying

characters of each of the plurality of data records being formed from the numbering, as taught by

Smethers, thus increasing information site access speeds by minimizing actions needed by the

user, as discussed by Smethers (col. 1 lines 57-65).

Conclusion

1.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

2.   Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Nick Corsaro at

telephone number (703) 306-5616.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nay Maung, can be reached at (703) 308-7745. Any response to this action should

be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth, Floor (Receptionist). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Nick Corsaro

NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER